DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 139 SO 032 713

AUTHOR Jackson, Janna
TITLE Come Out, Come Out, Wherever You Are: A Synthesis of Queer Research in Education.
PUB DATE 2001-04-11
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; *Homosexuality; Literature Reviews; *Sexual Identity; *Social Problems; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Gay and Lesbian Studies; Queer Theory; Research Synthesis

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the research in the area of teachers' attitudes, practices, and beliefs about gay and lesbian issues in education, focusing on homosexuality because although there is some overlap in regards to both the population and the issues, the differences between gay and transgendered issues add another layer of complexity to an already intricate topic. The paper focuses on K-12 education and is organized in a chronological conceptual framework of research from pre-1990, 1990-1993, 1994-1996, and 1997-present. In general, all categories of assumptions--pedagogical, research, epistemological, and queer--move from a limited singular view, to a dichotomous view, to a "continuum" view, to all views being questioned and problematized, pointing to a future of not just inclusion, but of radically questioning and challenging gender and sexual identity constructions. Instead of bipolar oppositions, or even continuums, scholars are viewing human beings as multi-faceted, ever-changing individuals. As these studies have progressed, so have the inclusion of queer issues in the larger conversation. Because queer issues in education are so politically and personally charged, the body of research on teaching regarding gay and lesbian issues cannot be seen as an isolated entity, particularly in light of the negative associations between gays and children promulgated by those wishing to oppress. (Contains 38 references.) (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 139

Come Out, Come Out, Wherever You Are: A Synthesis of Queer Research in Education

Session 13.31
Round Table
April 11, 2001
AERA National Conference
Seattle, WA

SO 032 713

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Janna Jackson

Janna Jackson
Boston College
Jacksojh@bc.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The saying, "Don't assume anything" summarizes the conclusions of some of the more recent researchers who make problematic assumptions underlying the body of research regarding teachers' attitudes, practices, and beliefs about gay and lesbian issues in education. Although it is impossible to assume nothing, especially about affectional identities since almost everyone grows up in a hetero-normative society, questioning assumptions is a beginning step many gay people take in their process of coming out and an initial step early researchers took as research acknowledging the presence of gay people in education was once considered taboo.

A popular t-shirt proclaims, "Don't assume I'm straight" on the front and "Don't assume I'm gay" on the back, which parallels the movement of research in this area, first questioning compulsory heterosexuality and then questioning notions of queerness. Just as some push to open up the umbrella term of multiculturalism to include gays and lesbians, others argue to expand notions of sexual identity to include transgendered people using the argument that gay, lesbian, bisexual, questioning, gender bending, transvestite, transgendered, and transsexual people are all gender rebels by transgressing society's gender norms and expectations.

In collecting, sifting through, and analyzing these studies, I bring my own set of assumptions. I did limit my research by focusing on homosexuality because, although there is some overlap in regards to both the population and the issues, the differences between gay and transgendered issues add another layer of complexity to an already intricate topic. I also focused on K-12 education because contrasts between K-12 and higher education complicate matters as higher education serves adults by providing academic freedom and K-12 education serves children who are surrounded by society's mythological inventions of innocence (Khayatt, 1997). Throughout this piece, I make reference to advancements made, implying that my notions of progress are universal. I recognize that they are not and that I come with my own agenda. To

generalize, I count more complex views over simplified ones as progress, whether they be pedagogical, research, change, epistemological, or queer assumptions.

Although some of the terminology in this piece may be new to those not familiar with research in this area, I clarify most phrases by exploring different takes on these terms by researchers. I use gender-bending as a more general term to encompass anyone who challenges gender norms, whether it be through attire, behaviors, mannerisms, or attitudes. Although some lesbians do not like to be subsumed under the term gay, I do use gay to refer to both males and females attracted to the same sex to simplify the discussion. This, in no way, indicates that I see gay men and women as the same. As with all people, multiple identities inform people's own reality. The older generation tends to reject the term queer as implying something different or outside of the norm, but I use the term in the way the younger generation defines the term as across a range of fluid identities, i.e. a more encompassing term to include all members of the spectrum, from those exclusively homosexual, to those questioning, from those who are experimenting with gender-bending, to those who have had gender-confirmation surgery, and including straight allies who align themselves with the gay community.

In organizing this research, I discovered that a chronological conceptual framework generated the most new information. Examining trends not only show progress, but also show in which direction, liberal or conservative, this progress evolves. It also helps situate this body of research within larger conversations, whether they be conversations held among gay activists, oppression fighters, researchers, or teachers. I made deliberate divisions into time blocks as I discovered that events outside this body of research help shape the literature.

Pre 1990

Although the overall abundance of articles on this topic surprised me, the scarcity of articles before 1990 did not. Compared to late nineties studies, these researchers' ideas are

oversimplified by today's standards, but there are also pearls of progressiveness. These early researchers were risk-takers and on the cutting-edge, explaining the more progressive ideas embedded throughout. I realize that I am "read[ing] events 'backwards' from the present, using new symbolic languages to give past events new meaning" (Zizek quoted by McLaren, 1995 p.111), but evaluating these early studies provides a base line to allow exploration of progress.

These pieces ask different questions with the earliest one exploring if being gay affects the attitudes, perceptions, and experiences of gay teachers (Olson, 1987). The latest one in the eighties asks if teachers can respond to the educational needs of gay and lesbian youth (Rofes, 1989), an often asked question in the nineties. The one chronologically in between is an intersection of the two, situating homosexuality in the larger conversation by asking "Why deal with homosexuality in education as an equity issue?" (Grayson, 1988, p.132).

The first two are much more in keeping with early studies by using gay teachers as points of access for safety reasons. Working with students, even if they are gay, is very problematic because of accusations of gay adults "recruiting" youth. Oppressors have used these fear tactics in the past by accusing Jews of stealing Christian children for human sacrifices and accusing Black males of raping young white females. Similarly, gay males have been linked with pedophilia despite estimates showing straight males are a disproportionate number of pedophiles (Harbeck, 1997). Some people have considered gay youth an oxymoron, clinging to notions of innocence. Rofes (1989) takes a risk by studying gay youth, but does so by working with youth who have self-identified and sought the services of gay organizations.

All researchers in this subsection operate from an interpretivist paradigm, using surveys and interviews for data. They explore how gay teachers and gay youth make meaning of their situations. Although one of the underlying tenets of this paradigm is multiple perspectives, all three find similar results: that negative stereotypes about homosexuals lead them to bifurcate

their lives and closely monitor their behavior in the public sphere. Leading dual lives has significant psychological repercussions leading to low self-esteem and internalized anger.

Because in the eighties some people regarded gay people with suspicion, these authors justify their studies. Grayson (1988) uses Kinsey's ten percent rule and statistics regarding negative attitudes about gay people. Using this general data implies that school settings are a microcosm of larger society. Rofes (1989) explicitly discusses the lack of data about educational settings and predicts areas where future research fills the gaps. Because of this dearth, researchers make general comments about drug use, suicide, and drop-out rates instead of using empirical data. Based on these generalizations, Grayson concludes these youth become a "drain on the economy" (1988, p.139) instead of appealing directly to people's sense of compassion, implying she believes people may not feel sympathy for this population. These researchers present homosexual youth as victims, a first step in any civil rights movement because there is no rationale for change if larger society does not view that class as being oppressed. The danger, though, lies in being stuck in victim-hood and not advancing to self-empowerment.

These researchers frame their question around the same problem: lack of information spurring homophobia. Two of the researchers lay the blame and responsibility for action on teachers (Grayson, 1988; Olson, 1987) whereas Rofes (1989) squarely places the blame and responsibility on the oppressed, "the failure of gay men and lesbians to effectively take up their cause" (p.445), implying that oppressors bear no responsibility in rectifying the situation. In addition, the two programs he lauds are designed for gay youth to develop coping skills in order to reenter public education. This places the burden on the oppressed to assimilate, taking a "teaching the culturally different" approach (Sleeter & Grant, 1987).

The studies present the classroom as a possible change site but address avenues outside the classroom as well. Olson (1987) takes both a trickle down approach, emphasizing educating

teachers, and an integrative one but only in literature, music, and art, subjects traditionally associated with homosexuals. Initially, she wants to take a "single group study" (Sleeter & Grant, 1987) approach of adding on gay issues but proposes inclusion because of overcrowded curricula. Grayson (1988) emphasizes "human relations" (Sleeter & Grant, 1987) by describing the problem as "homophobia hinders the development of all school children from growing into tolerant and compassionate members of a harmonious and cohesive pluralistic society" (p.136). Despite this optimism, she uses a deficit model whereas Olson (1987) and Rofes (1989) look to assets as well. Allusions are made to heterosexism, but none use Sleeter and Grant's more pro-active approach of challenging the system, instead working within the system to affect change.

None of the researchers view teachers as political agents with Olson (1987) describing political action as taking place outside of school. Most of the researchers see teaching as direct instruction with the students passively absorbing the material, although Rofes (1989) does emphasize that instruction should center on students' needs. The authors assume by including and presenting accurate information in the formal curriculum, automatically change will occur in student attitudes. Grayson (1988) alludes to a hidden curriculum when she says, "Clearly, exclusion and invisibility have been major means by which educators have institutionalized and maintained prejudice and discrimination against lesbians and gay males" (p.139) but uses passive voice to diffuse the blame. Rofes (1989) sees educators as taking a much more active and intentional role, "This 'de-gaying' of U.S. literary and historical figures sends a message of shame and denial to lesbian and gay youth" (p.452) but fails to recognize that the hidden curriculum sends the same message to straight youth as well.

The researchers assume that they can discover the effects of homophobia on education without laying out criteria for assessment. Rofes (1989) proposes knowledge transmission being imposed on teachers to make change, claiming that "rigorous training" is necessary to make

teachers "comfortable with gay and lesbian issues" (p.451) but Grayson (1988) takes a more progressive approach to educating teachers, "Simply understanding what it is like to be gay or lesbian is not the answer. We must *examine* the ways in which prejudice manifests itself" (p.137) hinting not only at a more active view of acquiring knowledge, but also at a more progressive means of affecting change. This first step of building awareness builds the foundation for more proactive approaches. Only Olson (1987), though, looks to teachers to help generate knowledge in this area by asking them for suggestions for future action.

None of the researchers view school as active sites of constructing identity. Grayson (1988) sees schools as mirrors of society where, "prejudice manifests itself in our society and is perpetuated in education" (p.137), implying that the outer world imposes its views on education. Following this logic, change must take place outside the classroom before it takes place within as Rofes (1989) states, "Issues of sexuality must move from the taboo into a public forum" before being able to "adequately serve the educational needs of this specific population" (p.451). Rofes (1989) reiterates that, "Schools are going to have to focus on the needs of young people rather than on the demands of parents or the larger community" (p.451). Grayson (1988) takes an opposing view of education, seeing manufacturing "productive members of society" as a "primary function of public education" (p.136). Both views ignore ways schools actively participate in constructing structures which serve to exclude those who are "different."

As with the larger gay movement, the inclusion of transgendered people does not take place until later with the exception of Rofes (1989) mentioning cross-dressers in passing. Although all authors tend to focus on the sexuality part of homosexuality, Olson (1987) does expand her vision when she uses the term "affectional preference" (p.80) and Rofes (1989) refers to the "gay and lesbian community" throughout his piece, pointing to future definitions of gayness. The studies run the sexual identity gamut with Olson (1987) viewing sexual orientation

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

as a dichotomy, Rofes (1989) as a trichotomy, and Grayson (1988) as a continuum. All take a one-dimensional view of heterosexuals and a fairly limited view of gays. When other aspects such as gender, race, and class are mentioned, they are mentioned more as solitary, multiple aspects of identity, not as interacting to inform each other. The focus on AIDS in Rofes' (1989) study along with his use of the term gays in conjunction with AIDS, gives his view of homosexuals a more male slant. Grayson (1988) comments on this tendency in gay studies, "a major portion of traditional work on homosexuals has been conducted by males and written from a male perspective, based on a male model" (p.143). Just as silence assumes straightness, lack of specificity when discussing homosexuality, presumes maleness.

Only one study directly addresses coming out but does so in an almost laughable way by today's standards, considering telling one person at school as coming out (Olson, 1987), a far cry from current views. This reflects her assumption that no teacher is what people in the nineties would consider fully out of the closet as revealed by the assumptions behind her survey question "What kept you from being open?" (Olson, 1987, p.78).

Several later works problemitize issues of sexual identity by recognizing the interaction between sexism and heterosexism. Rofes (1989) and Olson (1987) hint at this by mentioning the effects of displaying non-gender normative behavior, but neither make the connection between sexism and heterosexism explicit. Grayson (1988), on the other hand, lays the foundation for these connections and is often cited in later works, stating that "'Homophobia' ... is a primary barrier to our society's ever achieving gender equity. Most people [in her study] agreed that this fear is a primary factor in maintaining the traditional male role stereotype and that much of it is rooted in sexism" (p.133). She takes this a step further by discussing the impact in schools, "name calling and labeling which challenges male and female sexuality prevents students from participating in non-traditional, sex-role 'appropriate' courses and activities" (p.133) and

"Homophobia helps keep boys and girls 'in their place' better than any written rule" (p.135). This cutting-edge notion opens doors for further exploration despite its focus on masculinity.

The implications of these three studies point to a need for inclusion as well as policy changes to protect gay youth and teachers. Theoretically, they frame their studies from a more basic stance but do point to advances in thought, especially Grayson's (1988) exploration of the collusion between sexism and homophobia. These studies as well as others outside of the realm of education, lay the groundwork for more complex notions developed in the nineties.

1990 - 1993

Multiple events, often initiated by gay youth, occurred at the end of the eighties that impacted this body of research. The National Education Association added sexual orientation to their code of ethics in 1988. The Children of the Rainbow curriculum and ensuing battle increased media attention to these issues. Seattle produced its Safe Schools Report (1988) detailing tremendous amount of abuse suffered by gay youth in schools and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (1989) came out with alarming statistics about youth suicide, showing that gay youth committed over 1/3 of teen suicides (Harbeck, 1997). All of these served as a wake up call to gay activists, social workers, and researchers. No longer could the plight of gay youth be ignored out of fear of accusations of recruitment or pedophilia.

Two-thirds of these early nineties studies used statistics outside of education to justify their research, several citing findings from those just mentioned. In addition, several used the Kinsey ten percent rule. All but two of the researchers painted a pretty bleak portrait of gay youth, portraying gay youth as victims of gay-bashings and experiencing psychological trauma. One article practically pathologizes homosexuality in the following description:

> In the absence of appropriate opportunities for socializing with homosexual peers, gay youth will often avoid intimacy altogether and are more likely

> to resort to impersonal sexual encounters with adults. Such encounters will put the gay adolescent at risk for having an impaired capacity for intimacy, development of an aloofness which creates further peer estrangement to protect their ego, and an increased risk of developing sexually transmitted diseases (Telljohann & Price, 1993, p.44)

Although males do tend to realize their gayness through sexual fantasizing, females' discovery stems more from emotional feelings making the above quotation not only homophobic, but sexist as well. Those researchers who do take a more positive spin on gay youth, often do so in ways that still portray them as victims using phrases such as "survivors" simply for graduating from high school (Friend, 1993, p.210) and saying that "many excel or at least get by" (Uribe & Harbeck, 1991, p.11). Only Griffin (1991) saw homosexuals as having the power to empower themselves and helped her participants see themselves as special and unique.

The proliferation of studies in the early nineties in response to this critical need yielded a variety of studies. The number of studies using teachers as points of access doubled the number focusing on gay youth in this subset. The questions posed by the teacher studies evenly fell into two general categories: How do teachers use the inclusion of gay and lesbian issues to challenge homophobia and how educators' personal attitudes and beliefs impact them professionally. The researchers of the youth studies used youth to gauge teachers' practices in regards to these issues. Only two studies out of nine used members of the general population as sources of data, one focusing on prospective teachers, the other polling all students in addition to narrowing in on the gay youth. As in the eighties, researchers use gay-positive participants as "safe" entry points.

These researchers used case studies, interviews, surveys, or a combination of these methods. Some quantified the data, while most took a qualitative avenue. Most took a more passive approach to their study, presenting their findings and making recommendations based on

those findings. Woods and Harbeck (1991) express hope that "this research will be used as a catalyst for dialogue and change" (p.161), but only Griffin (1991) adheres to the action research paradigm, combining Lather's (1986) emancipatory approach and Cochran-Smith and Lytle's (in press) idea of using collaborative inquiry as inquiry as stance. In this study, the researcher uses taped interviews and plays them back for the participants, holding up a "mirror" to see their own collusion in their oppression. She uses collaborative inquiry to build participants self-esteem and empowers them to take action, in this case by marching in a gay pride parade as gay teachers, bringing their bifurcated identities together to form a whole. Griffin (1991) asserts that "Research is political" (p.169) and walks the talk by operating from a critical inquiry paradigm.

Many researchers explicitly acknowledge the foundations of their theory as stemming from feminist notions and oppression theories of racial minorities. Those researchers who used feminist ideology did so to frame their study and make the link between sexism and hetero-sexism. These ranged from acknowledging that gender-bending students and/or teachers are more vulnerable to homophobia to exploring the stereotype that all and only gay people have non-gender conforming mannerisms. Friend (1993) takes this a step further by exploring how homophobia and sexism operate together, "homophobic harassment is used to reinforce and enforce both heterosexism *and* sexism" (p.223) by "enforc[ing] a sexist arrangement and function[ing] to try to keep all students . . . from violating what is expected of them in terms of gender-role behaviors" (p.232). Although ignoring how both sexism and homophobia inform each other, this one-way cause-effect assessment paves the road for further analysis.

Those whose work stemmed from minority studies cite a lack of attention to gay and lesbian issues, employing a deficit model. Woods and Harbeck (1991) point to examples where researchers actively avoid gay and lesbian issues. A participant in one study remarked that teachers not disciplining students for using anti-gay slurs while disciplining racial ones send the

message that homophobia is not as important as racism (Sears, 1991). The lack of attention in the multicultural conversation implies the same. Researchers use ties to others who are oppressed to justify studies and to build theoretical coalitions with other minority groups. Statements like, "Heterosexism, like racism and sexism, censors by omission" (Hammett, 1992, p.251) make these commonalities explicit. In doing this work, not only do the researchers make parallels between sexual minorities and racial minorities, they also point to significant differences, the main one being the lack of positive messages from families. Friend (1993) quotes A.J. Smith as saying, "Lesbians and gays are the only oppressed group that was born and raised by our oppressors" (p.212). Although looking to groups such as the disabled and Australian Aborigines disproves this statement, the point is well taken. Telljohann and Price (1993) point to this difference but take a step backwards by saying, "the homosexual youth grows up without the sense of 'us' versus 'them' which is the essence of group identity afforded other minorities" (p.42). It is exactly this "us/them" mentality, whether held by the oppressors or the oppressees, that prevents advancements in prejudice reduction. These researchers take the first steps, although some are shaky, in seeing how all oppressions are tied together.

Telljohann and Price (1993) take a "teaching the culturally different" (Sleeter & Grant,1987) approach by using an understanding of this particular minority group to help gay and lesbian youth "adjust to the school environment" (p.55). Three of the nine studies put an emphasis on human relations (Sleeter & Grant, 1987), pushing for empathy and compassion, a possible direction for making progress in gay rights but also a risk for pity, as implied by Lankewish's (1992) statement about having "compassion for the oppressed" (p.220). The others promote multicultural education and border on social reconstructionism (Sleeter & Grant, 1987) discussing questioning heterosexism or pushing for a "reduction of heterosexual hegemony" (Sears, 1991, p.61) but few truly challenge existing structures. Despite urging educators and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

students to challenge the hetero-normative school atmosphere, two of the researchers express reticence about educators imposing values on the students (Friend, 1993; Lankewish, 1992), buying into the myth that mere introduction of gay and lesbian issues into the classroom promotes homosexuality. This myth, along with others, keeps educators silent.

All the studies point to homophobia as the problem, although some also include heterosexism. Blame ranges from teachers being "silent conspirators in sexual oppression" (Sears, 1991, p.74) to everyone's "conspiracy of silence" (Hoffman, 1993, p.56) that institutionalizes heterosexism. All point to school as sites for change but some also point to avenues outside of the school, such as politics (Hammett, 1992; Woods & Harbeck, 1991). Griffin (1991) points out that change must first take place internally before people can change their external worlds and puts this into practice in her study. A cautious trend runs through some of these studies with Telljohann and Price (1993) warning that if a system is conservative, then schools should refer gay students to support services outside of the school. Others specify health or sexuality education classes for introducing gay issues (Friend, 1993; Sears, 1991; Telljohann & Price, 1993; Uribe & Harbeck, 1991) equating homosexuality with sex. Four mention language arts class in particular (Friend, 1993; Hammett, 1992; Hoffman, 1993; Lankewish, 1992) but Hammett (1992) qualifies this by advising teachers to do so only if convenient and if the teacher determines the students are mature enough, implying this is a dangerous subject. All of the researchers base their studies on a deficit model, several citing specific incidents ranging from students dropping out to students' negative attitudes about homosexuality expressed in previous classroom discussion that prompted them to do their research (Hammett, 1992; Hoffman, 1993; Lankewish, 1992; Sears, 1991; Uribe & Harbeck, 1991; Woods & Harbeck, 1991). This takes a medical view of research and, in some of these studies, of teaching where the researcher and/or teacher diagnoses a problem and sets out to find a cure.

Pedagogically, most of the researchers see teaching as much more active than in the eighties by explicitly describing the hidden curriculum and viewing teaching as a political vehicle for social change. One author advocates for this political dimension of teaching, "yet the inculcation of respect for individual differences and of compassion for the oppressed, while indeed a political act, strikes me as part of a teacher's job" (Lankewish, 1992 p.220). The pedagogical methods of creating this change involve discourse between the students and the teachers instead of the direct instruction model implied in the eighties studies. These range from teacher led discussions where the teacher attempts to help students accept differences (Griffin, 1991) to a more student – centered one where the teacher only intervenes in the discussion in extreme cases (Lankewish, 1992). These researchers acknowledge a hidden agenda through systematic exclusion of positive images of homosexuals and systematic inclusion of negative images of homosexuals (Friend, 1993). Several see teachers either as challenging the "heterosexual curriculum" (Sears, 1991, p.74) by making the invisible visible or as helping students to challenge heterosexism. These researchers use theory to inform their practice, seeing the teacher as a cognitive decision maker in the classroom and as a positive role model, implying students learn through observation. Others describe the ideal relationship between the teacher and the students as being two-way, with Woods and Harbeck (1991) arguing that the amount of personal disclosure by a gay teacher should be seen the same as for straight ones. Telljohann and Price (1993), though, have a more limited view of teaching, labeling teaching practices as either positive or negative, glossing over the complexities of classroom interaction.

Hammett (1992) takes a more cautious view of teaching stating that she would "keep the discussions of all readings on intellectual and theoretical grounds. I would not feel comfortable with class members discussing their own sexual orientation" (p.255) and so would provide "guidance, structure, and strong teaching" (p.254). She does not put much faith in her students,

expressing reticence about student-selected materials and stating that teachers should determine "when students were ready for such public exposure on so controversial and sensitive an issue as homophobia" (p.255). Not only do these remarks discredit students' abilities, they perpetuate the hidden curriculum the other researchers are trying to dismantle by putting homosexuality in a theoretical box, relegating open discussion only to the private realm. Her own experiences lead her to conclude that, "Although I have in many ways empowered myself within the closed doors of my classroom, I have learned I have no real power in the educational system" (p.258). This pessimistic view, though, is not representative of the other researchers from this time period.

Most view knowledge as having parts that can be replaced by new information but Friend (1993) and Griffin (1991) see personal knowledge as existing in several layers requiring sifting through to get to the hidden or subconscious level. Hammett (1992) recognizes how schools shape and limit the learner's knowledge when she realizes she had taught *A Raisin in the Sun* for fifteen years without knowing that Lorraine Hansberry was a lesbian. All see teachers as using knowledge to inform their practice but Friend (1993), Griffin (1991), and Sears (1991) move a step beyond by describing knowledge, or lack of, as informing practice in subconscious ways.

These researchers portray the interaction between the outer world and schools as being in one direction, with society imposing its value system on schools. Many place schools within the larger heterosexist society with one portraying the media as the disseminator and construction site of stereotypes, "the negative ways in which gay people are depicted by the American media and, consequently, perceived by the American public" (Lankewish, 1992, p.219). Woods and Harbeck (1991) state that "our profession needs to examine the role of gender socialization" (p.162) using a verbal to displace the blame. Uribe and Harbeck (1991) also place the responsibility for homophobia on the outer world, "Cultural taboos, fear of controversy, and a deeply-rooted, pervasive homophobia have kept the educational system in the United States

blindfolded and mute" (p.11). Friend (1993) claims that schools "deeply reproduce and promote the very social inequities they are said to equalize" (p.210) beginning to recognize the more active role schools play in developing oppressive social structures. Hoffman (1993) does see school as a site for constructing meanings of the outside world when he discusses the changes *Torch Song* "wrought on [the students'] understanding of the world beyond school" (p.56) but does not recognize the more fluid, ambiguous relationship between school and society, instead presenting a dichotomy between the world in school and the world outside of school.

All of the studies present sexual orientation as either a dichotomy or trichotomy except for Sears (1991) who acknowledges that a lot of students question their sexuality, "students confronting same-sex feelings – which, in adolescence, may be the majority of a school's population" (p.74). A couple of the studies allude to transgendered people through describing gender bending behavior and mentioning drag queens, with one of the participants mentioning transsexuals directly (Friend, 1993). Most of the researchers define homosexuality through sexual behaviors by defining gays in terms of sexuality with statements like, "it is the basic assumption of this study that homosexuality is a normal variation in both sexual orientation and sexual behavior" (Uribe & Harbeck, 1991, p.13). Friend (1993) actively argues against this one-sided view, adding an emotional dimension although his piece focuses almost solely on sexual aspects of identity. Lankewish (1992) not only adds a romantic quality, but addresses a spiritual dimension to same-sex relationships as well. A few of the researchers allude to a gay culture with Hoffman (1993) mentioning "gay and lesbian solidarity" (p.55) and Hammett (1992) referring to a "fringe culture" (p.254) implying that gayness only exists at the edges of society. Only Griffin (1991) talks about gayness as a culture. Some of the researchers still view coming out as either being in or out of the closet, but others discuss it in terms of a process. Telljohann and Price (1993) see it more as a linear progression based on the number of people the individual

has told. Griffin (1991), though, discusses how decisions are made on a case by case basis with a complex set of flexible rules depending on the audience, context, and personal feelings.

Eight of the nine researchers mention AIDS with only one addressing how homosexuality is often discussed only in terms of AIDS, linking homosexuality with disease. Also, by using non-gender specific terms in relation to AIDS, researchers give the impression that all gays are male. Most lump all gay people together and all straight people together, only presenting differences through narrative excerpts. When researchers do mention differences, they treat them as separate aspects, none exploring how race, class, gender, or a multitude of other facets interact with sexual orientation to create a unique individual.

Most researchers do not explicitly address whether or not sexual orientation is a choice, possibly to avoid the controversy or to downplay the role of that question in the pursuit of rights. Uribe and Harbeck (1991) argue against gayness as a choice but then later use the phrase "sexual preference identities" (p.15). Lankewish (1992) starts to tread into this arena but backpedals for fear of taking a definite stand when he writes against the "common belief that gayness is 'caused' by external factors rather than internal ones, though not necessarily that it is 'biologically' determined" (p.255). Several researchers portray heterosexuality as the norm by placing it as a standard to make connections with homosexuality. Lankewish (1992) does this by encouraging his students to make parallels between straights and gays, making his goal for straight people to accept gays because *we* are like *them*. Uribe and Harbeck (1991) define homosexuality as "a normal variation" (p.13) implying that gay people are not "normal" but deviations from the norm. They also talking about passing as "posing as 'normal' among other normals" (p.13) explaining that the reason students pass is because "the rewards for being normal are so great" (p.14). Sears (1991) uses the term "sexual rebel" (p.32) which implies

going against the "norm" of heterosexuality. Woods and Harbeck (1991), though, explicitly argue against a deviancy theory that places heterosexuals as the norm by which to judge others.

These researchers begin to present teaching as a political act and most see positive possibilities for the future even though Hammett (1992) takes a more cautious approach. Sears, (1991) though, makes a pessimistic deduction based on his survey of prospective teachers attitudes and beliefs concluding that "deep-seated personal beliefs and feelings" make pro-gay action "not reasonable" (p.67). Surveying all the studies from this time period reveal that the researchers view research, pedagogical, epistemological, and queer issues as more complex than the simple dichotomies presented in the eighties but still are limited somewhat in their vision.

1994-1996

Whereas the end of the eighties brought about a lot of research studies on gay and lesbian issues, December 10, 1993 marked the first time a state took legislative action to protect gay and lesbian youth. Continuing with the trend of youth speaking up for their rights, gay and lesbian students across Massachusetts rallied and lobbied to get this legislation passed. From this stemmed a Commission which found shocking statistics such as 53 % of gay, lesbian, and bisexual students reported hearing teachers making anti-gay comments (Loutzenheiser, 1996). Based on this and other findings, this commission made a number of pro-gay recommendations concerning schools. The national media attention allowed this legislation to serve as a model across the United States. An increased amount of optimism and direct mention by three of the authors shows that this impact infiltrated research studies as well.

Despite the means by which the Massachusetts legislation began, the number of studies in this subset studying gay positive teachers still doubled the amount using gay youth as participants. Possibly because earlier researchers felt they needed empirical data to justify their research, conceptual studies did not emerge until the mid-nineties based on the studies I

reviewed. In addition, researchers did more case studies of teachers incorporating gay and lesbian issues into the classroom with five out of eleven (Athanases, 1996; Blinick, 1994; Boutillier, 1994; Redman, 1994; Sanders, 1994) during this time period versus two out of nine previously (Hoffman, 1993; Lankewish, 1992) and none during the eighties. This shows a move in two directions, from empirical research to more conceptual theory and from empirical research to implementation in the classroom. The studies that did use data analyzed it qualitatively. This move away from positivism to more interpretive research reflects larger movements in research on teaching. As with the previous time period, research stemmed from either feminist or multicultural works or both with some simply making links and others stating explicitly that they were, "Building on work done in other areas of oppression and bias" (Raymond, 1996, p.8) and acknowledging their predecessors, "my main influences include feminist methodology and praxis-based pedagogy" (Mac an Ghaill, 1994, p.156]. Mac an Ghaill (1994) takes an interesting twist by applying feminist concepts to exploring notions of masculinity and how they are interrelated to homo-eroticism and race. Only one (Epstein & Johnson, 1994) derived from gay and lesbian studies as they did a synthesis of select pieces.

The researchers tended to advocate for either the multicultural approach or a combination of multicultural education and social reconstructionism (Sleeter & Grant, 1987) with some arguing against the single group study format, terming it "race this year, gender next" (Sanders & Burke, 1994, p.71) or "adding on" issues as if they are "discrete entities" (Redman, 1994, p.143). Those who advocated for an integrative approach viewed the school as, "a microcosm of society at large" (Rogers, 1994, p.31) claiming that, "Schools both mirror and motivate such perceptions, reproducing a culture of fear" (McLaren, 1995, p.106). Those advocating for a social reconstructionist approach went beyond seeing schools as simply reproducing larger society to describing them as active sites of constructing knowledge, claiming that, "Modern

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

schooling systems are significant cultural sites that actively produce and reproduce a range of differentiated, hierarchically ordered masculinities and femininities" (Mac an Ghaill, 1994, p.56). Redman (1994) recognizes the larger implications in regarding schools only as mirrors of larger society, "If schools are said simply to reproduce homophobia, sexism and heterosexism, there is a danger that they are let off the hook" (p.142). These researchers' goals include deconstructing and reconstructing gender-roles to be more inclusive, proposing a more fluid, ambiguous delineation between genders.

Whereas over three quarters of the studies done in 1990-1993 justified their research in some way, just under two-thirds did during this time period, indicating more acceptance of queer studies in education. Those who did justify their research cite some of the same statistics along with historical and personal examples. These descriptions of gay youth as being self-destructive and victims echo earlier studies with one researcher suggesting providing "violence prevention and crisis intervention training" (Mallon, 1996, p.3). Those who do manage to "develop a strong sense of self worth" are described as being "resilient" (Raymond, 1996, p.7). Some of the researchers, though, explicitly argue against portraying gay youth as victims, "Although many of the experiences of young lesbians in school are negative, I was impressed by the strength of the women in my sample. I would not want to portray them in any way as victims as they certainly do not see themselves as such" (Rogers, 1994, p.44). Mac an Ghaill (1994) also focuses on the positive or "the plusses of being black gays" (p.170) and takes this a step further by arguing that gay youth take an active part in their own constructions, "There is a danger in examining black gay students' schooling experiences of unintendedly adopting a passive concept of subject positioning, with the student portrayed as unproblematically accepting an over-determined racial and gender/sexual role allocations. . . they are active curriculum and masculine makers" (p.160). Epstein and Johnson (1994) also recognize that youth are not just passive recipients, "The

processes are more active than the term 'socialization' implies. Children are both acted upon and are active in making their own meanings" (p.205). These latter researchers point to a new direction not only in the research studies, but also in gay activism – a move beyond victimization to self-empowerment.

The prior studies point mainly to homophobia or an interaction of homophobia and heterosexism as the problem but usually frame it in terms of individuals. Some of the studies from this time period not only see "individual acts of meanness" (McIntosh, 1989, p.10) but also bias embedded in larger school structures, "heterosexism occurs in individuals, but is just as likely to occur unthinkingly at the structural and institutional levels" (Loutzenheiser, 1996, p.60). McLaren (1995) looks not to school structures but to language as part of the problem, "lack of vocabularies in our schools for making sense critically of heterosexuality and homosexuality (p.113). Mac an Ghaill (1994) argues against "monocausal explanations" (p.158). Instead of viewing homophobia and heterosexism as simply parallel to other "isms," he paints a much more interactive view of oppressions, claiming that schools "fail to address the complex multifaceted nature and historical contextual contingency of the mediation of these oppressions" (p.154). Raymond (1996) puts it more succinctly, "all oppression is interconnected" (p.9).

Unlike some of the previous studies who saw sex education classes as sites for change, only two out of eleven studies specifically mentioned them, with most arguing that teachers should infuse these issues throughout the curriculum and outside of the classroom as well. Researchers tended to focus on teachers as both responsible for the problem, "teachers who fail to challenge homophobic comments implicitly condone them" (Rogers, 1994, p.41) and as responsible for fixing the problem, "teachers are of necessity the frontline of support" (Raymond, 1996, p.8). Sanders and Burke (1994), though, acknowledge that teachers are just one cog in the larger wheel, "we cannot hope that this will eliminate the weight of 'evidence'

given in the media, some homes, peer groups, etc. that to be gay or lesbian is unacceptable" (p.75) but counters this with a message of empowerment: "If, however, we do not enable students to have self-knowledge and self-confidence we are encouraging them to be oppressive to others and themselves" (p.69). Scholars are expanding the vision of their answers.

In addition to simply integrating gay and lesbian issues into the classroom, some of the researchers uncovered other means of educating students by expanding their pedagogical views. Sanders and Burke (1995) propose using everyday events as "teachable moments" such as coming out or addressing anti-gay remarks and "follow[ing] up with an 'educational' discussion" (p.75). Others propose challenging student assumptions while providing a safe environment for students to grapple with their own beliefs, "encouraging students to think critically, to question their own knowledge, is one of education's aims" (Boutillier, 1994, p.137). Blinick (1994) shows how gay teachers can use coming out as increasing students' cognitive dissonance, forcing students to deconstruct and reconstruct their own images of lesbians. As with earlier studies, researchers describe both a "formal curriculum . . . and the hidden curriculum with its equally powerful messages" (Rogers, 1994, p.38). Loutzenheiser (1996) defines these messages, "The Othering and silences are often interpreted by students as a confirmation that homosexuality is shameful and bad" (p.61). Epstein and Johnson (1994) also note that "Sexual constructions are all-pervasive in the school context, while, at the same time, sexuality is specifically and vehemently excluded from the formal curriculum or confined to very specific and heavily guarded spaces" (p.217). These researchers propose that teachers reexamine their own hidden agendas to render visible the invisible, to "make the contingency of myth visible by unmasking its narrative structure" (McLaren, 1995, p.111). Mallon (1996) suggests doing this by "examin[ing] current curriculum for bias" (p.4) and Loutzenheiser (1996) takes this further by proposing that teachers imagine themselves as a gay student in their own class to help them

uncover their own heterosexism. These pedagogical views move beyond the transmission view in earlier studies to a much more expansive vision of student –teacher interaction with some seeing teacher and students working together to co-construct meaning (Epstein and Johnson, 1994; Mac an Ghaill, 1994).

Epistemologically, these researchers tend to view knowledge not as fixed but as more fluid and constructed either personally or socially, although some are still rooted in a more transmission view of passing on knowledge. McLaren (1995) examines how language is used to shape knowledge. Rogers (1994) allows her participants to generate their own knowledge, "I did not compile this list, it was written by a young woman who has recently spent several years in a school as a lesbian pupil; she is an expert, I am not" (p.46). Epstein and Johnson (1994) recognize schools as local sites of knowledge production while acknowledging that similar attributes shared by schools allow researchers to generalize. Some of the researchers take a more ecological view of schools such as Mallon (1996) seeing the problem as a "poor fit" between lesbian and gay youth and the school environment (p.1). Others explore how schools fit into the larger context by trying to "locate schooling with the larger socio-political processes" (Mac an Ghaill, 1994, p.156) and "situate the process of schooling within the present state of the capitalist formation of society and the reproduction of asymmetrical relations of power and privilege" (McLaren, 1995, p.109). Overall, researchers view schools as making incremental changes to shift the center and see a two-way interaction between school and society outside of school.

Most researchers address gay youth and teachers, but, for the first time in this set of studies, some expanded this population to include students with gay parents or family members (Loutzenheiser, 1996; Mallon, 1996; Raymond, 1996). Although gender bending is addressed, only one specifically mentions transsexuals but in a way to distance them from gay and lesbian issues, "Do not confuse or equate transsexuality or transvestitism with homosexuality" (Mallon,

1996, p.5). The majority of the researchers present sexual identity as a dichotomy, but several expand to include bisexuals. Others, though, see sexuality as more fluid, arguing against "binary oppositions" (McLaren, 1995, p.112) and problemitizing even the notion of a continuum by questioning the definitions of the two anchors, "heterosexuality and homosexuality have no 'essence' of meaning, but rather, the terms are continually and culturally negotiated within diverse historical and social arenas and in terms of competing vectors of power" contending that notions of both are "fictions" (McLaren, 1995, p.112). Even though several researchers still discuss homosexuality mainly in a sexual context, several argue against this portrayal, "for too long, discussion about sexuality and sexual orientation has focused on the sexual acts" instead arguing for, "broadening the focus to include the development of affectional, erotic, and romantic orientations in the context of relationships" (Raymond, 1996, p.8). A few mention cultures or community, but the researchers modify these nouns with the adjective sexual, implying that these communities revolve around sex (Mallon, 1996; Redman, 1994). Researchers focus less and less on AIDS and when they did, they mentioned it in passing, usually in terms of providing safe sex education. Raymond (1996) warns against mentioning gays only in the context of AIDS because it pathologizes homosexuals. In the mid nineties, researchers portray gay people as more complex, versus the static portrayal in the eighties.

Just as some of the prior studies added on race, so did some of these with only Mac an Ghaill (1994) studying how each informs the other. Gays and lesbians are usually lumped together but Rogers (1994) argues against this because of the common assumption that gays are male. She further distinguishes gay men and lesbians by addressing the unique "double-bind" of lesbians as women are not supposed to have sexuality but adds that the advantage they have over their male counterparts is more latitude in gender bending. Sanders and Burke (1994) also see more diversity, stating that there is "no such person as a 'typical gay person'" with gay people

being represented in all sections of society (p.68). Straight people, on the other hand, are either all lumped together or seen as either gay friendly or non-gay friendly except for Redman (1994) who moves beyond this dichotomy by acknowledging "the real diversity of *heterosexual* . . . relationships" (p.134). Some researchers still frame heterosexuality as the norm, referring to gayness as the "margins" (Boutillier, 1994, p.141) and gay people as variations of the norm (Raymond, 1996; Rogers, 1994). More researchers, though, argue against this limited view (Epstein and Johnson, 1994; Loutzenheiser, 1996; Mac an Ghaill, 1994; McLaren, 1995; Redman, 1994), "by failing to recognize the existence of gay men, lesbians, and bisexuals, schools participate in naming heterosexuality as 'normal'" (Loutzenheiser, 1996, p.60). McLaren (1995) takes a closer look by seeing how "heterosexuality has meaning only in relation to other identities such as homosexuality" so homosexuality is "constructed as the antitheses of what heterosexual communities consider 'normal'" (p.122). Mac an Ghaill (1994) adds a new dimension by recognizing that the norm is considered *white* heterosexuality. Only one researcher directly addresses whether or not sexual orientation is a choice and he does so by questioning its validity, "the tendency of gay theorists to essentialize sexual identity as biological or psychological is fundamentally an Anglocenteric and Eurocentric perspective" (McLaren, 1995, p.119). This parallels the larger gay movements stance that it should not matter whether homosexuality is nature or nurture in terms of civil rights.

The implication of these studies is that teachers need to start changing and examining their own practices not only to include gays and lesbians in the classroom, but also to bring in questions about the construction of gender and sexual identity. Schools need to be "willing to acknowledge structural heterosexuality" to "change the culture of the school" (Loutzenheiser, 1996, p.63). Theoretically, researchers move towards more complex underpinnings of their research, questioning and problemitizing previously dichotomous or even more limited notions

of pedagogy, epistemology, and queerness. In addition to advocating for policies to accommodate these changes, Rogers (1994) argues against no promo homo legislation. As these issues are brought to the forefront by activists, researchers, and politicians, conservative politicians have responded by passing legislation to prevent these changes from occurring whereas prior to the nineties, few even considered incorporating queer issues into the classroom.

1997-Present

The changes between the earlier time periods were marked by reports and legislation. 1996 saw impacts more by individuals than by impersonal policies. Not only did Ellen DeGeneres cause a media sensation by coming out bringing widespread attention to these issues, but Jamie Nabozny made history by taking his case to courts. Winning nearly a million dollars in damages sent a strong message to educators that they must take protective action. In addition to statistics used by earlier studies, researchers also specifically mention Nabozny (Fontaine, 1997) and allude to Ellen (Carlson, 1997; Fontaine, 1997) and a more recent study mentions Matthew Shepherd (Ginsberg, 1999). Both these successes and losses have helped shape the direction of queer research.

The questions asked in the late nineties parallel earlier questions except that they take the results of earlier studies as assumptions and move the conversation along further. Fontaine (1997) asks if teacher attitudes have changed over the last ten years and concludes that the answer is no. Jennings (1999) and Khayatt (1997) explore possible consequences of teachers coming out, a question unheard of in the eighties. Carlson (1997), like Grayson (1988), delves into gayness as part of a larger equity issue, but, unlike Grayson (1988), he does not ask if it should be included, instead he assumes it should and asks how it should fit into multicultural education. Instead of questioning if teachers should include gay and lesbian issues in the classroom, Mathison (1998) asks what is the best way to prepare teachers to include queer issues

in the curriculum. Ginsberg (1999), as well, frames her question based on earlier conclusions that teachers do contribute to heterosexism and queries into how. Overall, questions have gone from asking if something happens, to assuming it does, and exploring the means.

As with the majority of the other studies in the nineties, those that are not conceptual are qualitative, relying on narratives, interviews, and surveys. As earlier studies do, these studies draw from multicultural and feminist perspectives but also, as the above questions indicate, its own body of research on gay and lesbian issues in education. Ginsberg (1999) and Mathison argue to be a "part of the *multi* in multiculturalism" (Mathison, 1998 p.151). Mathison (1998) goes on to analyze how little attention is devoted to queer issues in multicultural textbooks literally by counting pages. The studies mostly range from multicultural inclusion to social reconstructionist with the exception of Jennings (1999) who focuses more on human relations (Sleeter and Grant 1987). Carlson (1997) advances the argument from challenging structures in schools, to challenging larger ideas, "democratic multicultural education must challenge 'essentialistic' world views that take categories such as gender, sexual identity, and race for granted as 'natural' categories having fixed meaning" (p.251). Scholars fight for inclusion.

Once again, the classroom is seen as the site of change. In addition, the researchers challenge teachers to ask, "*What teacher behaviors most alienate gay and lesbian students*?" (Mathison, 1998, p.151) and state they must "learn to critique 'the ways of thinking and behaving characteristic of the culture into which they were born'" (Greene (1973) quoted by Ginsberg, 1999, p.48). Every research study included in this group addresses the hidden curriculum of schools, "transmitt[ing] dominant heterosexist ideology to the younger generation" (Jennings, 1999, p.1) but now the hidden curriculum is framed much more as a hidden agenda, arguing that educators "go out of their way" to intentionally "cleanse" the curriculum (Carlson, 1997, p.236). These, "educational acts of omission and behavioral acts of commission"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(Fontaine, 1997, p.103) are framed as acts of collusion. Although some of the researchers still view teaching as disseminating information and make the assumption that providing information will automatically cause change, "Prejudice and stereotypes diminish as understanding increases through educational efforts that provide accurate information" (Fontaine, 1997, p.104), others have a more interactive pedagogical view. Teachers are portrayed as reflective practitioners and acknowledge how "education might transform knowledge" (Ginsberg, 1999, p.49). Schools are seen both as being affected by society, "'big brother' control does not work in a world increasingly bound together with popular culture and electronic images" (Carlson, 1997, p.239) and as affecting society, "Direct approaches to changing attitudes toward homosexuals through educational programming have proven more successful" (Rudolph (1989) quoted by Fontaine, 1997, p.106). Ginsberg (1999) views school's responsibility as not only educating children, but also the community, "It must be expanded 'outside the circle' to include parents, community members, and other institutions" (p.55). Researchers make some pedagogical and epistemological advancements, while others stick to the idea of education as transmission.

Ginsberg (1999) expands her notion of queerness by placing Nathan, a transgendered student, in the umbrella category of sexual identities but the others stick to a more traditional circle of just including gays and lesbians. She also moves beyond seeing sexual identities as purely sexual, "their intimate attractions to members of the same sex tended to be emotional rather than sexual" (p.51). Carlson (1997) propels the definition of gayness further by expanding it beyond romantic relationships between individuals to a culture. Mathison (1998) refers to gay culture as well but sees it in a limited way, "Gay and lesbian culture, unlike cultures identified easily by ethnicity, skin color, or ancestral origin, has more subtle defining characteristics seldom visible through the traditional lenses used to identify the surface characteristics of a cultures: foods, holidays, dress, crafts" (p.152). Someone only needs to attend one of hundreds

of gay prides across the world to see some of those "surface characteristics." Carlson (1997) also expands those included under the queer umbrella, defining queer as "a militant form of standing outside of conventional roles" (p.235). Khayatt (1997), though, takes a step backwards by claiming that "A teacher's coming out to students by its very nature is an allusion to sexual matters and is consequently considered outside the realms of what is appropriate for children to know or discuss" (p.130). Harbeck (1992) would respond to this by saying, "If I defined traditional marriage as merely legal permission for unrestrained sexual access, many would be offended at my narrow and pejorative perspective" (p.132). Just as in any human progression, steps forward, steps backwards, and, at times, no steps at all mark a movement.

Assumptions that developed in the research now come into question in the late nineties. Even though Ginsberg (1999) concludes that "sexuality is genetically determined" based on "students' stated sexual identities . . . [being] determined with little or no sexual experiences" (p.51), Jennings (1999) refers to those, "seeking to discover the 'cause' of sexual orientation" (p.21) using quotation marks to indicate that there is no cause, sexual orientation just is. Carlson (1997) argues against the "bipolar construct" of sexual identities (p.235) and Ginsberg (1999) calls into question the two-dimensional linear notion of a range of sexual identities, "if the notion of a sexual continuum has any currency" (p.51). Khayatt (1997) chimes in by exploring sexual identity terms as more fluid, "the categories in which we attempt to place ourselves are socially constituted and acquire meaning in space and time. A sexual category is not a static formulation, and neither is our relationship to that category"(p.131). Some of these questionings of previously established assumptions, though, move the argument backwards instead of forwards. Carlson (1997) questions the implications of queerness, claiming it "represents a celebration of the outside that may not effectively link up with a democratic progressive politics of inclusion" (p.235). This hearkens back to the "teaching of the culturally different" (Sleeter & Grant 1987)

approach of assimilation. Khayatt (1997) argues against teachers coming out with tenuous claims, making the reader suspect that she is being defensive because of self-acknowledged pressure to be out. She argues that by not making declarative identity statements, she forces students to use critical thinking skills by remaining ambiguous, but I would argue that "silence is straight" (Parmeter quoted by Hart, 1992, p.171). Khayatt (1997) does, though, present a much more realistic picture of coming out, claiming that it is "not simply the opposite of being in the closet" (p.131) and that it occurs in fits and starts. In keeping with his repeated use of the phrase "gay culture," Carlson (1997) defines coming out as "involv[ing] the reconstruction of the self in terms of identification with a collective, historical struggle" (p.245). Questioning previous assumptions, whether used positively or negatively, helps advance the conversation.

Ginsberg (1999) presents heterosexuality as the standard of judgment by comparing gays to straights but Jennings (1999) counters by quoting Khayatt (1992), "heterosexuality is normative. It is hegemonic. It is also institutionally sanctioned, ideologically affirmed, and socially encouraged and expected. It is not surprising that the majority of heterosexual people presume that theirs is a 'natural conception of the world'" (p.2). Carlson (1997) states the dangers of heterosexism, "In normalizing communities, identity is typically constructed in rigidly oppositional ways, with one pole of identity privileged and viewed as 'normal' and the other pole viewed as deficient and 'abnormal'" (p.245). Carlson (1997) is the only one who acknowledges that silence presumes both straightness and whiteness. He discusses how black youth struggle with "affirm[ing] both their gayness and their blackness" (p.248) advocating for "ruptur[ing] the boundaries between groups. . .to emphasize the multiple subject positions. . .we all occupy" (p.251). He expands the notion of acknowledging multiple realities across individuals to acknowledging multiple identities within individuals.

Overall Implications

Just as Khayatt (1997) describes coming out as occurring in fits and starts, these studies show that their "coming out" occurs in similar patterns. Overall, though, all categories of assumptions, pedagogical, research, epistemological, and queer, move from a limited singular view, to a dichotomous view, to a "continuum" view, to all views being questioned and problemitized, pointing to a future of not just inclusion, but of radically questioning and challenging gender and sexual identity constructions. Instead of bipolar oppositions, or even continuums, scholars are viewing human beings as multi-faceted, ever-changing individuals.

As these studies have progressed, so have the inclusion of queer issues in the larger conversation, although somewhat more slowly than the progression within its own field. Hopefully, inclusion will not mean that these issues are subsumed and co-opted as researchers and activists constantly struggle with accommodation without assimilation. Politically, this struggle has parallels with the tensions among conservative gay groups such as the Log Cabin Republicans, moderate gay and lesbian groups such as the Human Rights Campaign, and more grass-roots radical queer groups like Act Up, Lesbian Avengers, and Transsexual Menace. Although divisiveness prevents a minority group from putting up a united front, this constant tension helps shift the center incrementally.

Because queer issues in education are so politically and personally charged, the body of research on teaching regarding gay and lesbian issues cannot be seen as an isolated entity, particularly in light of the negative associations between gays and children promulgated by those wishing to oppress. The larger world both informs and is informed by the ongoing discourse created by these researchers. Even this two-way interaction model is oversimplified, for there is also ongoing dialogue across bodies of research as both feminist and multicultural perspectives contribute to and take from this particular conversation.

References

(1988). Safe Schools Report. Available: www.safeschools-wa.org/ [1999, 12/10/99].

Athanases, Steven. A gay-themed lesson in an ethnic literature curriculum: Tenth graders' responses to "Dear Anita." Harvard educational review 66(2), 231-256.

Blinick, Nancy. (1994). Out in the curriculum, out in the classroom: Teaching history and organizing for change. In L. Garber (Ed.), Tilting the tower: Lesbians, teaching, queer subjects (pp. xii, 280). New York: Routledge.

Boutillier, N. (1994). Reading, writing, and Rita Mae Brown. In L. Garber (Ed.), Tilting the tower: Lesbians, teaching, queer subjects (pp. xii, 280). New York: Routledge.

Carlson, D. (1997). Gayness, multicultural education, and community. In M. Seller & L. Weis (Eds.), Beyond Black and White (pp. 233-255). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (in press). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in communities. In A. Iran-Nejad & D. Pearson (Eds.), Review of research in education (Vol. 24).

Epstein, D., & Johnson, R. (1994). On the straight and the narrow: The heterosexual presumption, homophobias and schools. In D. Epstein (Ed.), Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education (pp. 197-230). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Fontaine, J.-H. (1997). The sound of silence: Public school response to the needs of gay and lesbian youth. In M. Harris (Ed.), School experiences of gay and lesbian youth: The invisible minority . New York: Haworth Press.

Friend, R. (1993). Choice, not closets: Heterosexism and homophobia. In L. Weis & M. Fine (Eds.), Beyond silenced voices : class, race, and gender in United States schools (pp. xi, 437). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Ginsberg, R. (1999). In the triangle/out of the circle: Gay and lesbian students facing the heterosexual paradigm. The Educational Forum, 64(Fall 1999), 46-56.

Grayson, D. (1988). Emerging equity issues related to homosexuality in education. Peabody Journal of Education, 64(4), 132-145.

Griffin, P. (1991). From hiding out to coming out: Empowering lesbian and gay educators. In K. Harbeck (Ed.), Coming out of the classroom closet : gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula (pp. 273). New York: Harrington Park Press.

Hammett, R. (1992). A rationale and unit plan for introducing gay ad lesbian literature into grade 12 curriculum. In P. Shannon (Ed.), Becoming political: Readings and writings in the politics of literacy education . Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Harbeck, K. (1997). Gay and lesbian educators: Personal freedoms, public constraints. Malden, MA: Amethyst Press and Productions.

Harbeck, K.-M. (1992). Coming out of the classroom closet: Gay and lesbian students, teachers and curricula. New York: Harrington Park Press.

Hart, E. L. (1992). Writing in the margins: A lesbian and gay inclusive course. In M. Hurlbert and S. Totten (Eds.), Social issues in the English classroom. Urbanna, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Hoffman, M. (1993). Teaching Torch Song: Gay literature in the classroom. English Journal, 83(5), 55-58.

Jennings, K. (1999). Understanding the experiences of openly gay and lesbian educators. Available: www.glsen.org/pages/sections/library/references/005.article [1999, 12/05/99].

Khayatt, D. (1997). Sex and the teacher: Should we come out in class? Harvard Educational Review, 67(1), 126-143.

Lankewish, V. (1992). Breaking the silence: Addressing homophobia with the Color Purple. In C. M. Hurlbert & S. Totten (Eds.), Social issues in the English classroom (pp. viii, 356). Urbana, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English.

Lather, P. (1986) Research as praxis. Harvard Educational Review, 56 (3), 257-277.

Loutzenheiser, L. (1996). How schools play "smear the queer". Feminist Teacher, 10(2), 59-64.

Mac an Ghaill, M. (1994). (In)visibility: Sexuality, race and masculinity in the school context. In D. Epstein (Ed.), Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education (pp. xii, 239). Buckingham <England> ; Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Mallon, G. (1996). It's like opening Pandora's box: Addressing the needs of gay and lesbian adolescents within educational settings. In L. M. Bullock, R. A. Gable, J. R. Ridky, & Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. (Eds.), Understanding individual differences (pp. vi, 50). Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children.

Mathison, C. (1998). The invisible minority: Preparing teachers to meet the needs of gay and lesbian youth. Journal of Teacher Education, 49(2), 151-155.

McIntosh, P. (1989). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. Peace and Freedom, 10-12.

McLaren, P. (1995). Moral panic, schooling and gay identity. In G. Unks (Ed.), The gay teen : educational practice and theory for lesbian, gay, and bisexual adolescents (pp. 250). New York: Routledge.

Olson, M. (1987). A study of gay and lesbian teachers. Journal of Homosexuality, 13(4), 73-80.

Raymond, E. B. (1996). Making a difference: A call for education and action. In L. M. Bullock, R. A. Gable, J. R. Ridky, & Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders. (Eds.), Understanding individual differences (pp. vi, 50). Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children.

Redman, P. (1994). Shifting ground: Rethinking sexuality education. In D. Epstein (Ed.), Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education (pp. xii, 239). Buckingham <England> ; Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Rofes, E. (1989). Opening up the classroom closet: Responding to the educational needs of gay and lesbian youth. Harvard-Educational-Review, 59(4), 444-453.

Rogers, M. (1994). Growing up lesbian. In D. Epstein (Ed.), Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education (pp. xii, 239). Buckingham <England> ; Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Sanders, S., & Burke, H. (1994). Are you a lesbian, miss? In D. Epstein (Ed.), Challenging lesbian and gay inequalities in education (pp. xii, 239). Buckingham <England> ; Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Sears, J. T. (1991). Coming out of the classroom closet : gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula. In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), Coming out of the classroom closet : gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula (pp. 273). New York: Harrington Park Press.

Sleeter, C.-E., & Grant, C.-A. (1987). An analysis of multicultural education in the United States. Harvard-Educational-Review, 57(4), 421-444.

Telljohann, S., & Price, J. (1993). A qualitative examination of adolescent homosexuals' life experiences: Ramifications for secondary school personnel. Journal of Homosexuality, 26(1), 41-56.

Uribe, V., & Harbeck, K. M. (1991). Addressing the needs of lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth. In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), Coming out of the classroom closet : gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula (pp. 273). New York: Harrington Park Press.

Woods, S., & Harbeck, K. M. (1991). Living in two worlds: The identity management strategies used by lesbian physical educators. In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), Coming out of the classroom closet : gay and lesbian students, teachers, and curricula (pp. 273). New York: Harrington Park Press.